New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations.

FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 1921

Owned by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Published daily. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; R. E. Maxfield, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By mail, including Postage. IN THE UNITED STATES.

	One Year	Six Months	One Month
By Mail, Postpaid.			
Daily and Sunday.....	$12.00	$6.00	$1.00
One week, 35c.			
Daily only.....	10.00	5.00	.85
One week, 30c.			
Sunday only.....	4.00	2.25	.40
Sunday only, Canada.....	6.00	3.25	.55
FOREIGN RATES			
Daily and Sunday.....	$26.00	$13.00	$2.40
Daily only.....	17.40	8.70	1.45
Sunday only.....	9.75	5.12	.86

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTY

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to say your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein also are reserved.

Two Bad Taxes

Whatever of usefulness attached to the excess profits tax and the high surtaxes on incomes ended with the war. But their evils remain and multiply. Their incidence has become not only grossly unfair—as it always was—but highly dangerous. They are blights on business, causes of unemployment and preventers of prosperity. Moreover, they are no longer productive enough to make them worth while.

The excess profits tax is perhaps the more evil of the two. It greatly contributed to the preposterous and unhealthy inflation of 1919, and consequently it was largely responsible for the inevitable depression which followed and from which the country now is suffering. In a period of wildly rising prices and wages it was easy to pass the burden along with a substantial addition, but now, with a market distinctly favoring the buyer, the depressing effects of the tax are greater than ever.

At a time when industrial efficiency and price stabilization are essential to the return of prosperity the excess profits tax operates to penalize the efficient enterprise, puts a premium on inefficiency in production and distribution and postpones in many cases the adjustment that is needed to bring about a change in the public temper toward prices. And such a change must come before we can have prosperity in full measure.

But these are not the only objections to the tax. It is so grossly unequal as to penalize conservative financing and to offer a premium on stock watering. One authority cites the results in the cases of four well known corporations engaged in the same line of business, which paid respectively, 5, 11, 18 and 30 per cent of their net incomes, the differences being largely due to differences in organization and capitalization. The turn of a hair in a definition of what constitutes invested capital—the basis of the tax—makes a difference of a million dollars or more in the levy on the earnings of a particular corporation. The prosperity of the stockholders and the workers of a given enterprise is often dependent on the mere form of its organization. The repeal of the excess profits tax is an essential to the restoration of normal business conditions and the reëmployment of jobless workers.

And the reduction of surtaxes on incomes is essential. It is not merely that surtax rates running up to 73 per cent are intrinsically unfair; not merely because the rates are so high that the tax becomes increasingly less productive; but also—and mainly—because the exorbitant rates divert capital from productive employment to non-productive or wasteful use.

Even if a tax to penalize the rich could be applied without penalizing the rest of us, this tax would be faulty because escape from it is too easy. The rich man puts his funds in tax-exempt securities, of which the supply is unlimited. The rest of us pay 8 or 9 per cent because the rich man is not allowed to lend to us and we thus lose the benefit of his weight in the money market. And, of course, high capital costs mean high manufacturing costs and high prices. The capital which industry sorely needs goes to municipalities and county and state governments, where much of it is expended, to put it moderately, in a way that adds little to our general store of goods.

The fallacy of the assumption that the rich can be penalized through taxation—that their capital can be confiscated—without injuring every wage and salary earner, every small investor and every consumer has been demonstrated countless times. It is time for our tax makers to realize that, no matter who has title to it, capital works for everybody. When the agencies of production are heavily taxed all of us are affected.

The recent suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury that the maximum surtax be reduced to 40 per cent this year and 33 per cent next seems a moderate one—puts the levy too high rather than too low. It would seem better to fix it at 33 per cent at once, since that is, as nearly as can be calculated, the highest rate which will not drive money out of production into public securities.

The Senate's Naval Bill

The naval appropriation act, as the Senate passed it, carries $494,000,000. The Senate added $100,000,000 to the House total. But even the Senate's total represents a reduction of $135,000,000 from the estimates submitted by Secretary Daniels. The House bill was nearly $300,000,000 below the Daniels estimates.

These facts should be borne in mind by critics who would fasten on Congress the charge of extravagance in military expenditure. Congress is working at this session, as at the last three sessions, to lessen the cost of the military services. The army appropriation bill which President Wilson pocket-vetoed last March because it offended Secretary Baker's sensibilities carried only $346,000,000. Mr. Baker had asked for $699,000,000. The reduction was extraordinary and marked a rapid getting away from the Wilson era of post-armistice extravagance. For the time being, until the nation's finances are balanced, it has been necessary to cut deeply into army and navy appropriations, and Congress has taken the lead in doing so. It deserves credit, not abuse, for the showing it has made.

There is little probability, however, that the final bill will carry a total of $494,000,000. The bill now goes to conference committee and will undoubtedly be cut to meet the views of the House of Representatives. The sum appropriated in the naval bill for 1920-'21 was $433,000,000. This was $149,000,000 less than Mr. Daniels's estimates. The House wants to keep the personnel for next year down to 100,000 men. The Senate has fixed it at 120,000. It is easy to make a compromise on this item which will save $15,000,000 or more. The Senate has made provision for the construction of two airplane carriers, and the navy needs airplane carriers more than it does additional battleships. Here is another item on which an adjustment could be made reducing the Senate bill's total by from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000.

Were the Treasury not in straits a naval bill carrying $500,000,000 at the present value of the dollar might not be excessive and save money in the end. Yet less will be granted this year, and circumstances may allow a material decrease next year and the year after.

Congress has to look at the two sides of the problem—to consider the necessities of national defense as well as the claims of economy.

The Hate Fomenters

Says an unnamed Washington correspondent of The World:

"A few years ago America held upraised the flaming torch as a beacon of hope to a world sorely distressed, so spiritually spent and physically broken, so weary and heart crushed, that, despite its magnificent courage and superb sacrifices, it almost despaired. To no people has there ever been such a glorious opportunity presented as to the American people when they entered the war. Into their hands was put the sword of the avenger, and while the blade still ran with the blood of the foe they beat the sword of justice into a symbol of hate. To America was offered the moral leadership of mankind and to give to the world a new code; by the example of her own disinterested service to lead the world to righteousness. For a few months that leadership the United States held and it was a better world in consequence, and then the powers of evil again prevailed. All that has been gained was lost. Sacrifice, devotion, unselfishness no longer reigned and hate alone ruled."

Here is language, as Mr. Dooley once said, "yeh cud waltz to," and so familiar one can repeat it when asleep.

For any nation to brag of moral leadership is of doubtful wisdom—eulogy along this line being better left to others—but the point may be conceded that a great opportunity was frittered away. How? By a pride of opinion that naturally led to a fall, by an ecstasy of stubbornness, by a self-sufficiency that proved to be insufficiency. Discord was introduced by those who conceived it their duty to foster suspicion of our war partners. The peoples which had at least done as well as we had learned they were ruled by a selfish and narrow imperialism. The mean insinuation was constant that only Germany could be trusted.

It is time to cease calumniating. The spirit of hate does not rule. So far as it exists it flows for the greater part from the element that first held Germany should be allowed her way; next, that a deadlock peace was all that could be hoped for, and, lastly, behind the screen of a false reading of the Fourteen Points, fought for further punishment of the innocent. It was Germany, always Germany, that was served—the Germany that was the apostle of might and the hymner of hate. No wonder the American people lost patience with the hypocrisy that suddenly became solicitous for righteousness and came to distrust their natural leader who seemed to give it ear.

Are the people to be esteemed fools easily deceived by the company which in the first instance derided the cause of the Allies, ascribed the war to the rivalries of capitalism, then didn't know what it was about and scornfully laughed at the idea that this country, or any other, was moved by moral influences? If George Harvey presented America as material and sordid he but repeated a doctrine widely heralded by the minority which now ascribes our entry to sublime altruism and is dissatisfied because the settlement was not perfectly idealistic.

If there is disharmony, if the Allies have to some degree been wedged apart, the chief blows have come from the class which continues meanly to attack the motives and conduct of the great people who fought for right if it ever was fought for. These are the fomenters of hate—these are the ones who are working against future peace—these are they who are now as morally inadequate as they were when the war began.

Promising the Unpromisable

When Mr. La Guardia, President of the Board of Aldermen, asked Mr. McAneny, of the new Transit Board, for "absolute assurance" against any modification of the subway contracts he, of course, as a man of intelligence, anticipated the answer Mr. McAneny would be constrained to give. He knew in advance that no such assurance could be given. It is not the practice of government agents, when a matter is under consideration and inquiry is incomplete, to announce an advance judgment.

The law under which the new Transit Board is operating contemplates the possibility of modifying the subway contracts, not in the interest of the companies, but in the interest of the public. This is fundamental and applies a principle of daily use in common life when conditions change and a modification is of mutual benefit. In the subway contract are provisions which favor the companies and others that favor the city. Perhaps it is possible to readjust the trade to the benefit of both parties.

Whether concessions offered on one side are a fair compensation for concessions on the other is a question that obviously cannot be decided until there is a specific offer. So no exact action can be promised in advance. To do so would be to defeat the very end sought. Mr. La Guardia needs scarcely to be informed that it is impossible during bargain-making to map out a precise course.

The Transit Commission is seeking to find a formula of settlement which will concede to the companies their contractual rights, which they cannot be deprived of, and at the same time secure to the city full benefit and value of any contract modification. It is not an easy task. Perhaps an agreement can be reached. Perhaps it cannot be. There can be no exact prediction, and it is foolish to ask an answer to the unanswerable.

Personally Interested

When President Harding paid an unannounced visit to the Interstate Commerce Commission's headquarters to discuss some details of the railroad situation he manifested a direct personal interest in the commission's work which no other President had ever shown so pointedly. Many times in the past the commission might have been saved from blunders if the vital importance of its decisions had been more clearly realized at the White House. Its members were isolated from the general work of the Administration. Yet the President, who appoints the commissioners, is also responsible for the reasonableness of their policy and the quality of their work. It is to the public interest that he should consult with them concerning the non-judicial phases of their work.

Left to itself, the commission adopted the methods of a court. It looked on its functions narrowly. It felt no obligation to discharge in a broad, constructive way its duty of regulating the carrier. It allowed the latter to be starved. It had shut itself up to such an extent that on the day when Germany declared war on Russia it handed down a rate decision ignoring the vast economic and political consequences of that already discounted action. A few months later it had to admit its fault.

The confiscation from which the railroads have suffered is traceable largely to the commission. Since the deplorable consequences of that policy have become manifest there have been signs of repentance and of keener appreciation of what the commission ought to do to put the railroads on their feet. Case decisions are not enough. There should be a railway policy.

That the President is actively concerned and will personally support a program of reconstruction cannot but stimulate the commission's desire to restore the carriers to solvency as the first step toward insuring the public once more the benefits of efficient, high-class railway service. The caution of the President may be assumed to be sufficient to prevent his exerting pressure in an illegitimate way or interfering except as concerns large matters.

"Captains Courageous"

There is rejoicing in Gloucester. The crew of the Esperanto is safe. No one was lost, no one even was injured, although the schooner struck a submerged wreck and foundered in shallow water a mile and a half from land.

It is a wild life, this, compared to which the ease of the landsman seems ignoble. It is a life full of hardship and suffering, Homeric in its daring and endurance. These hardy fishermen, sons of the old New England, keep alive under practically the same conditions the traditions established when the Yankee whalers sailed close to both poles.

America joins with the crew in mourning the loss of this famous ship. The Esperanto last fall sailed the kind of race in the international fishermen's regatta which made the country justly proud of her. Her loss is a blow to American sportsmanship. It remains for another to hold the honors she won. But the men who sailed her are safe and can sail as efficiently another ship.

Recasting Article X

Difference Between a League for Peace and a League of Nations

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The semi-official statement from France of a tentative suggestion for the recasting of Article X is interesting and useful. It is the first evidence of a recognition of the fundamental difference between a league for peace and a league of nations; the first recognition of the difference between the two underlying conceptions: the one being that of "a several undertaking," the other of "a joint obligation."

America can agree and has always in the past been ready to agree to non-aggression on her own part, and she can agree thereto with any one or all other nations, but she cannot agree and never in the past has agreed to guarantee for other nations that they shall be non-aggressive. That is an undertaking they must enter into each for itself.

To put it more broadly, any form of international agreement which provides for organs of government or for enforcement of its terms is one that is conceived in terms of power and thereby one which involves the principle of a super-government, and it is therefore at outs with our policies, our theories, our established form of government and our conception of what can be safely attained.

Indeed, this might be taken as a touchstone: If proposals which are made embrace the creation of organs of government or provide for an enforcement of their terms, America is not in a position to consider them. If they do not they can be examined and considered upon their merits.

CHARLES STEWART DAVISON.
New York, June 2, 1921.

The Radium Supply

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A dispatch from Baltimore in your issue of May 31 was to the effect that an early exhaustion of the world's supply of radium was feared and that no new radium-bearing ore had been discovered in the last five or six years.

According to Dr. Victor L. Hess, one of the leading radium experts in the United States and associated with the largest radium mining and refining companies in America, the visible supply of radium is increasing and there is no imminent danger of a radium famine. Before the war the world was dependent almost entirely upon Europe for its supply of radium, which was derived mainly from pitchblende. To-day, however, the extensive deposits of radium-bearing carnotite in the Paradox Valley of Colorado and in the adjoining districts of Utah are being mined.

Already more radium has been taken out of the carnotite district than the most competent authority predicted would be found there. The difficulty of the processes of extraction and the costly equipment necessary are more a limit to production than the ore supply. And yet despite these facts the price has remained about stationary.

Radium deposits have also been discovered in Argentina, in England, in Canada, in Portugal and in Russia.

ARTHUR ROEDER.
New York, June 1, 1921.

Mme. Curie and the Curie

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: That in all the interesting information that has been given us by the newspapers in regard to the work of Mme. Curie nothing has been said about the curie is curious. Other eminent scientists have been honored by having their names, reduced to common nouns and beginning with small letters, devoted to the designation of specific units in the various branches of physics to which they made distinguished contributions. Thus we have the watt, the ohm, the volt, the farad, the coulomb, the lambert, the henry and the ampère.

And this distinction has not been withheld from Mme. Curie. At the International Congress of Radiology, which was held in Brussels in 1910, and of which Mme. Curie was the president, it was agreed to call the unit of radio-activity—namely the amount of radium emanation which is in equilibrium with one gram of radium—by the very appropriate name the curie. (But as in studying radium one works with exceedingly small quantities, it is the term the millicurie that is in most frequent use.) Thus Mme. Curie is sure of grateful remembrance on the part of scientists so long as science shall endure, and that is doubtless until the end of civilization.

CHRISTINE LADD-FRANKLIN.
New York, June 1, 1921.

The Conning Tower

"GIRL FOR ILLUSIONS"

WANTED Girl for Illusions. Give full particulars in first letter, salary expected, etc. Photos required; same returned. Write K. E. JONES, Broughton, Kansas.
—The Billboard.

"Girl for Illusions." K. E. Jones,
Thy message clear from Broughton, Kansas,
"Like one clear harp in divers tones,"
Leads me to spill some stanzas.

Much have I traveled, much I've read,
And men have bared to me their hearts;
I know the thoughts of Mazie's head,
Her sciences and arts.

Oh, K. E. Jones, deem me no churl,
But, on this famed terrestrial ball,
Nobody ever wants a girl
For anything else at all.

"Sometimes we fear," says Christopher Morley in The Evening Post, "that the newspapers, in spite of the large attention they pay to sport, do not show themselves very good sportsmen." No, they infrequently are good sportsmen; but even so they are better than any other large group we have intimate knowledge of.

As to the large attention newspapers pay to sport, few of them do. Most of the papers we see have "sporting" pages topheavy with boxing, racing, and baseball news and comment.

The Campaign Is Launched

Sir: Can I interest you in my Write Your Own Epitaph Campaign? It has so long been suspected that the epitaphs selected or invented by the bereaved failed to hit the nail on the head, as it were, that I hardly need to dwell on the advantages of the new idea. Cousin Florence says she is with me to the death on this. She says just put up a simple headstone with "She Never Bought Steel Common," and let it go at that. May I not add that Cousin Florence is right there when it comes to Curb Coppers? As for myself, I rather favor "Her Speed Was Good, Her Judgment Poor." This will insure my grave being immediately recognized by my friends and family, all the members of the 42d Precinct, and the traffic cop who stands half way down the hill in Yonkers.

DAISY BELL.

More than that, we are in violent favor of a Write Your Own Obituary Drive. Including the headline. Our chief fear, when we see a careless motorist making for our headlights, is—if we chance not to be alone—that the headline will be "Famed Bard Joy Rides to Doom" or "Noted Wit in Death Pact."

Shoots From the Young Idea

[An essay on Success, by an 8th term high school student]

One of the highest attainments that can be reached by man in his lifetime, is sucess. Sucess being one of his greatest achievements there is no doubt that there were many obstacles that were necessary to pass. Begining at the bottom of the ladder, he gradually rose, rung by rung, as a result of his perserverence, self-sacrifice, and ambitiousness, until he reached the top. Jealousy and Hatred on the part of others, were like obstacles in his path. He gained many enemies and few friends but nevertheless he reached his goal by fair play.

"It must be said," Mr. Edwin Francis Edgett feels, in The Boston Transcript, that it must be said, "that while Alice Adams and Arthur Russell talk glibly and smartly, the glibness and smartness are not their own, but the novelist's." The Alice-Arthur dialogues struck us as being not particularly glib nor smart; they seem natural and ordinary, and exactly what those two young persons would have said. If there is anywhere a writer with a greater gift for transcribing natural dialogue—not the author's stuff, but the character's—than Mr. Tarkington, perhaps Mr. Edgett will give us his name.

"If you need any Persian or Chinese Rugs," advertises a commercially candid Madison Avenue ruggery, "it will pay you to come and see our stock before you make your selection elsewhere."

Film Crit's Tot Days Harked Back To

Sir: When I was little the song I liked best was "Take Back the Heart That Thou Gavest." I learned it from Harriet, the nursemaid, who used to be called "Big Hattie." I sang it thus:

"'Take back the heart that thou gavest'—
Certainly.
'What is my anguish to thee?'
Nothing.
'Take back the freedom thou cravest,'
All right.
'Leaving the sorrow to me,'
Of course."

And grandma used to say, "Amelia, listen to that child! She'll come to no good end!" And now see!

HARRIETTE UNDERHILL.

She recognized the two men, the police said, as the trio who attacked her.—The World.
Feminine megalomania.

"May Mademoiselle Lenglen," prays Mr. Arthur Brisbane, "soon give up tennis for maternity!" Even, however, if she doesn't, we should like to see a match between Mlle. Lenglen and Mrs. May Sutton Bundy, the well known mother.

"No great woman," Mr. Brisbane goes on, "should remain single." Nonsense! Ain't she singles champion?

F. P. A.

Canada and Japan

Discussion of Renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance

Special Correspondence of The Tribune

OTTAWA, Canada, June 1.

The comments in the American press on the question as to whether the United States should or should not keep abreast of Japan in naval outlay and as to whether a renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance as framed at present would or would not be construed as an act unfriendly to the United States are being discussed in several Canadian papers and have been referred to by public men and politicians. Perhaps the most important matter that Arthur Meighen, Canada's new Premier, will discuss when he represents the Dominion at the Imperial Conference of Premiers in London in a few days will be this topic.

Friendly Feeling

In Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton, Kingston and most central and eastern cities there are very few Japanese and they are law-abiding and desirable citizens. In British Columbia there is much the same feeling that prevails in California; there is frequent reference to the labor situation and to the probability of Orientals in great numbers coming to this country. Throughout Canada, however, there is no feeling against Japan. The desire is to be friendly, but it is realized that thousands of Americans are strongly opposed to any arrangements that might even permit of the possibility of Great Britain's being an ally of Japan in the remote eventuality of war. Present intimations at Ottawa are that at London the Premiers of Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and possibly other portions of the British overseas dominions will be consulted before anything definite is done.

Naturally there is speculation as to what attitude the Canadian Premier will take. The Ottawa Journal, which stands very close to the Meighen government, has published an interesting editorial on the Anglo-Japanese issue, with special reference to the way it is regarded in the United States, laying emphasis on the interpretation that Americans will be likely to put on Canadian and British action. The Journal says:

"Arguments against a renewal are undoubtedly powerful. Why, it is asked, should a renewal be necessary? The causes which made the treaty of 1905 desirable, if not necessary, are gone. Japan is not now in danger from either Germany or Russia. She is virtually supreme along the eastern Asiatic coast. The League of Nations, of which she is a member, is struggling toward disarmament; the United States offers no menace. Why, then, should Japan be afraid? And will the renewal of the treaty contribute one iota toward preservation of the peace of the world?

"Such are the arguments against renewal that might be advanced by disinterested nations. From the standpoint of Canada, however, there is another—the argument of the United States. There is a widespread belief in the Republic that Great Britain is bound by treaty to support Japan in a war with the United States. It is, of course, a wrong belief, because under the Peace Commission Treaty of 1914, passed by the United States Senate, Britain is preserved from such a terrible contingency. Nevertheless, this American belief exists. It is held by a vast number of people who do not trouble to think about treaties; and to its existence can be traced much of the distrust which exists among our neighbors in respect to British aims. The formal renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance will strengthen and deepen this belief. It will place a powerful weapon in the hands of anti-British propagandists, it will sow suspicion and distrust; and declaration that it does not involve the United States will touch only the few and fail to impress the many.

"Premier Meighen, whose views may go a long way in deciding the issue, cannot but be impressed with this consideration. Mr. Rowell, whose knowledge of foreign affairs is surpassed by few Canadians, put the case forcibly in the Commons some weeks ago when he said:

"Good Relations All Round"

"'The government of this country cannot afford to ignore the feeling that exists in the United States in reference to this alliance. I submit for the consideration of the government the question whether it would not be found, after careful examination, that it is in the interest of good relations between the British Empire and the United States on the one hand and between Japan and the United States on the other, in the interest of good relations all round, that this treaty should not be renewed. . . . Not that we love Japan less; but we want to be friends with every nation; we do not want any alliances that will prevent us from playing the rôle of friend to every nation in the world.'

"This, in effect, is the stand that has been taken by Premier Smuts. It is the stand that has been taken, in part, by Mr. Hughes of Australia (he wants a treaty that is acceptable to both the United States and Japan) and also by Mr. Massey of New Zealand. And while it is perhaps well that Canada should preserve an open mind on the matter, realizing that there may be factors which, from a British standpoint, make renewal of the treaty desirable, it is a stand that, we repeat, could be taken with justice and reason by the representatives of the Dominion."

The Park Shortage

Only 7,250 Acres in Four Boroughs—24,726 Acres Needed

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been going to the parks on Sunday afternoons in order to see them in full use, and I advise others to see them at this time. On a Monday morning we see the disorder and the wear, but it is only in seeing the cause of this disorder that we can realize the labor and difficulty of keeping the parks up to their present standard.

In Prospect Park one Sunday there was a band concert playing to capacity, and on the adjoining meadow were thousands of people walking or sitting on the grass. The walks were crowded, especially in the region of the concert grove, the boat house and the upper part of the lake. There was no disorder, no rowdyism, but a great crowd taking its pleasure rather seriously. The boats on the lake were all in use—one couple I overheard say they had waited two hours to get a boat.

Prospect Park is in wonderful condition. Much of it is sufficiently well kept and rich in its materials to be worthy of the finest country estate.

The Sunday Crowd

On another Sunday I went into Central Park at Fifth Avenue and 106th Street. It is one of the crowded regions and the police were active in their efforts to keep people off the grass. A great crowd was on the North Meadow and around its edges, but it was not disorderly; it simply hadn't room enough. So it was also on the lake and in other parts of the park.

No one knows what the actual figures of attendance are at any New York park, and no one can guess what the maximum capacity of a park may be. It is certain that as the number increases the damage to the park becomes greater, because it is physically impossible to protect the planting and grass at certain congested points. Changes in the park, such as broadening the walks, making more paved areas where the crowds congregate and fences in some places, would help considerably in reducing the injury due to crowds, but, after all, isn't the real cure for park congestion more parks, just as more subways are the cure for subway congestion?

Brooklyn, with a population of 2,018,356, has one acre of parks for every 1,682 people. The Bronx, with a population of 732,016, has one acre of parks for every 185 people, not including the new Bronx River parkway.

Manhattan has 10.3 per cent of its area in parks, or 1,446.6 acres. On this basis Brooklyn should have 4,970 acres in parks.

The Bronx has 15 per cent of its area in parks. This percentage for Brooklyn would mean 7,410 acres.

It may be urged that the Bronx parks are for Manhattan as much as for the Bronx, and this is true of Brooklyn. In fact, it is now easier to get to Brooklyn from lower Manhattan than to the Bronx, so that any parks in Brooklyn will be for all Manhattan and Brooklyn.

If the population of Brooklyn ever reaches the density of that of Manhattan, 161 an acre, it will be 8,007,149, which might happen in fifty or sixty years. At that time it would need, at 1,000 people an acre of park, 8,000 acres, which is only a little more than 15 per cent of the area.

Central Park, of 843 acres, was begun in 1857, when New York (Manhattan) had only 813,669 people.

Prospect Park, of 526 acres, was begun about 1870, when the population of Brooklyn was 419,921.

These parks were not much in advance of the 1,000 people an acre standard, so we should at once proceed with the purchase and development of parks amounting to 818 acres in Brooklyn, which, in addition to the 1,200 acres existing, will give 2,018, or one acre for each 1,000 population.

Taking the area of all boroughs (except Richmond), 164,846 acres, 10 per cent is 16,484. All parks in these four boroughs to-day amount to 7,250.5 acres. To keep the proportion for the whole city up to the present standard of Manhattan, there should be in Brooklyn and Queens (since Manhattan can have few more parks and the Bronx is well supplied) 9,234 acres additional.

Town planners and park experts are loath to admit that any smaller provision would be safe. I believe that a higher percentage of total area in parks would be better and would make it arbitrarily 15 per cent (the proportion in the Bronx), determining always to have in use at least one acre for each 1,000 of population. English town planners try to provide five acres for each 1,000 of population.

15 Per Cent Standard

For the whole city, excluding Richmond, we should have 24,726 acres, or 15 per cent of area, in parks, more than three times what we have now.

We who believe that city life is the best life should see to it that the city does not choke from increase, but that it be always reasonable in its extensions and grow as a whole, not part by part.

We must have more parks and we must have them now, even if it is necessary to get special legislation to permit the issue of the long term serial bonds required. The full payment for any park should be deferred until the surrounding district is fully developed, since a park is never scrapped, never wears out and with competent maintenance never depreciates in value.

CHARLES DOWNING LAY.
New York, June 3, 1921.

A Placid Race

(From The Washington Star)

Inhabitants of Yap, in their complete indifference to what is going on, may be regarded as an example of social conservatism carried to the extreme.

Miss Rembaugh's Statement

Detailing Her Handling of Cases of Incompetent Soldiers

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am writing to ask The Tribune for space to state the facts in regard to certain attacks recently made against me in The New York American. In these attacks I am accused, mainly by implication, of making large sums of money from cases of incompetent soldiers sent me by the Red Cross and of trying to extort fees from such soldiers greater than those allowed me by the court in the incompetency proceedings. This accusation is absolutely untrue. The facts of the whole tempest in a teapot are as follows:

About a year ago I was asked by the Red Cross if I would handle some of these cases. I expected to have one or two referred to me. In fact, I have had twenty-one, though only a few have been completed. These incompetency proceedings require each two applications to the Supreme Court on motions and a trial before a sheriff's or other jury. The court fees payable run from $15.45, the lowest shown in my accounts, to $52.30, the highest. These disbursements I have in each instance paid from my own pocket.

Until recently I handled these cases, receiving the fees awarded by the court in the proceeding out of the compensation paid the soldier. Such fees are properly small ($75 being the highest). Indeed, I am in full agreement with the contention that no fee or disbursement should be payable out of the soldier's estate and that the government should attend to this matter.

At this time I realized that the number of cases and the expense of handling them had become so great that I could not afford to go on at that rate of loss. From all these cases I have received $178.75 and have disbursed $137.80, leaving $40.95 to apply to an office cost of $522.90. I have therefore stood an actual loss of $481.95.

I therefore notified the Red Cross that I could not continue unless the Red Cross or, where possible, the relatives made up the difference in actual cost only. There was, naturally, never any question of asking the incompetent soldier to pay anything more, no matter what loss. This has been explained to each recent applicant. They were never asked $100 as a fee; only told that the cost, including fee and disbursements, would probably come to between $75 and $100. A subtraction of the average disbursement shows where the fee would be.

This is the complete history of the whole business. It seems to me an entirely proper situation. In fact, I had the temerity to think I had been rather decent in doing all this work at a loss and have therefore been rather stunned at the attitude of the paper in question.

BERTHA REMBAUGH.
New York, June 2, 1921.

The "Battle Hymn" and Others

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There are some amazing statements in the letter of your correspondent W. H. Price about some of our patriotic anthems. He speaks of the tune of "John Brown's Body" as "very popular," though "the text is impossible"; and in the next sentence declares that "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" is "musically impossible because of its hipperty-skippity meter and irregular lines." Really, one must wonder if he ever heard either of the songs. For, as everybody but himself must know, the music of both is the same; Mrs. Howe's sublime poem having been set to the "very popular" tune of "John Brown's Body," which in turn had been taken from an old camp meeting and revival hymn.

As to the "hipperty-skippity meter and irregular lines," most people regard the "Battle Hymn" as being in a notably dignified and impressive meter, and its lines are certainly as regular as the art of prosody could make them. Would your correspondent regard the hexameters of Homer as "hipperty-skippity"?

His estimate of "America" as measuring up, in both words and music, to the requirements of a national hymn is entirely judicious. Haydn, Beethoven and Weber esteemed it as one of the finest compositions of the kind in the world. That "the tune is not ours" is, however, only partly correct. It was originally ours, for it belonged to us in Colonial days before we became a nation, and I cannot see why in becoming independent we should have canceled our title to it, any more than to our language. Seeing that it has been adopted during the last century and a quarter by about a dozen different nations, including the kingdoms of Prussia, Saxony and Bavaria, the German Empire as a whole, the kingdom of Denmark and for a time the Russian Empire, the fact that it was not composed upon our soil should not debar us from its use.

That "America," with all its superb qualities, is "the only one which people will sing" will scarcely be subscribed to by the millions who have heard the "musically impossible" "Battle Hymn of the Republic" sung by vast multitudes with a zest, a swing and a sonorous splendor rivaling the "Marseillaise" itself. I fancy that it was not found "musically impossible" or "hipperty-skippity" at St. Paul's Cathedral in London on Monday last.

W. F. JOHNSON.
New York, June 1, 1921.

Out of Date

(From The Los Angeles Times)

There will be no more robber heroes in history. The days of Claude Duval and Jack Sheppard on the highways of England were exploited in books, but everything they ever did has been duplicated recently in American history. They wore period costumes, had road horses with fancy names and used clumsy pistols. The highway robbers of to-day wear evening clothes, ride in motor cars and carry automatics. Years later historians may be writing of our sky knights, such as Frank Luke or Raoul Lufbery, but they won't celebrate our highwaymen. That sort of hero worship is gone—and good riddance!